Dear Larry, 12/15/72

We are having heavy rains, with dense fog, and the prediction is for a blizzard. Last night a reporter phoned me and arranged to come here this a.m. I kept it clear for him, took from my files what I knew he'd want, and was waiting when he phoned to say he'd best postpone if because of the waether, and I agreed. So, with the busted-up day, before getting back to the work I must do, this to put you in a better position if and when you go to your editors with another idea again and get brushed.

I don t know what this guy will do, if anything, but he is at least starting. I did not solicit his interest, by the way, and I've never met him. He was spoken to by one to whom I offered help when there was what I regard as a repressive more that will soon be in the courts against him and his.

What he has been talking to me about is something about which I phoned Bob at least three times, with no single call-back. Naturally, I haven t called Bob since. The cost of a call to me is negligible, so I presume Bob was not motivated by some new economy wave. Nor do I thinkhe did not get all three messages. Or more.

You know the essence of the story that may emerge. Depending on this reporter and his paper, in my view it can be a major one. It may, I realize, be nothing. But this guy at least has done some of the things I sug ested, consulting standard sources, and is beginning to reconstruct on his own what gets into an area where I am bound by confidence. If he winds up doing the possible, then the Watergate will be put in a different perspective, firmly tied to the White House and to CIA and to others serving CIA, and Hunt will be shown to be more and other than represented and engaged in illegal domestic intelligence while with the CIA and with a public-relations agency the identity of which you should be able to guess part of it. This goes back at least seven years. You know where it crossed my trail and I think hurt me.

I am going to let this guy have access to but not use of my domestic-intelligence stuff, unless I'm paid for it. I have a query out on a story. I'm not optimistic, but I am broke and I must try. I think it is a good story the major liability of which is the media hangup on me.

Your paper seems to have someone in Washington on this story, not Bob. The name is unfamiliar to me. Both Washington papers have talked to your people in Chicago and S-T's. One gave me the right names. but they also got only what had been printed.

What seems to be emerging, and I emphasize seems because it is not certain, is that the White House realizes that it can be rather firmly tied to the broader caper and it engaged in shifting the responsibility elsewhere, particuarly Creep. The one problem I see in this is the stretching of the dedication of those who will be victimized. They are dedicated, those I've called the dedicated wrong, and they make take it in silence. One of the more interesting aspects is that appearance of CIA-connected lawyers for the "defense". I told you the exceptional size of Hogan & Hartson. There were only eight cars at Dorothy Hunt's funeral (a jeep joined later). Bitman was there. This is not the normal obligation of a merek lawyer.

Among the interesting pasts in the legal talent is Rothblatt's, not the only thing like it. His more spectacular recent cases all served CIA interests, as in transferring in the public mind responsibility for CIA SEAsia excesses and assassination onto the Army. For the moment at least in confidence, I tell you that there had been a local CIA guy, radical right, who claimed to have info on the JFK assassination. His will directed that all of it be conveyed to Rothblatt. From a mutual friend, his and mine, I am told it happened. Rothblatt more interesting?

If this thing comes to a head, I'll get copies of the stories for you.

Best,

I think you recognize the problem I have preserving everyone's interest, not telling one guy what I learn from another. Isn not.